REMARKS

In this response, new claims 56-60 have been added. Thus, claims 1-16 and 19-60 are now pending. The Office Action issued by the Examiner has been carefully considered by Applicant.

Claim 48 has been amended to correct a simple typographical error. No narrowing of claim coverage is intended by this amendment.

Claims 1-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. sec. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou et al. (U.S. 6,330,499) and Spaur et al. (U.S. 5,732,074).

An obviousness rejection requires that there be some teaching or suggestion in the prior art, which the Examiner has a duty to set forth in a clear manner, in order to make a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicant's independent claim 1 recites that the gateway node in the vehicle comprises at least one real-time interface processor (RTIP) and at least one application processor. The Examiner has cited Chou at col. 8, lines 34-51, which describes the operation of the remote service center. Thus, it is not clear to Applicant if the Examiner appreciates the foregoing wording of claim 1 which recites "in the vehicle". The Examiner has not made clear how the remote service center operation relates to the gateway node in the vehicle. Clearly, the section of Chou relied upon by the Examiner is not sufficient to make a prima facie case, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn for this reason.

Chou does describe a client computer device 101 that communicates to the remote service center 200 by means of the network interface 107 (col. 4, lines 7-14; col. 4, lines 39-41; and Fig. 3). Chou also describes that the client computer device 101 performs several functions (col. 4, lines 39-40) and manages the state of active requests and vehicle status, among other functions (col. 4, lines 58-61). However, Chou does not describe the use of two or more processors in the gateway node with one processor performing real-

time operations and the other processor performing high-level processing functions. The Examiner has not presented any argument that supports any such teaching or suggestion by Chou.

The Examiner has also cited Spaur (col. 8, lines 7-23), which describes a controller 30 for providing communication protocols in association with the Internet (col. 8, lines 24-27). Spaur here teaches that controller 30 is preferably a single microprocessor that performs multiple tasks using a real time operating system. For example, one of these tasks is I/O management. However, Spaur does not teach or suggest the performing in a gateway node of real-time operations on a first processor and the performing of high-level processing functions on a second processor.

Accordingly, even if controller 30 of Spaur were incorporated into the system of Chou, a person of skill in the art would still at most only use a single processor as there is no suggestion in either Chou or Spaur to do otherwise. Furthermore, for the sake of argument, even if a person of skill in the art were to use two processors in the system of Chou, there is no suggestion in either Chou or Spaur to do real-time operations on the first of such processors and high-level processing functions on the second. The Examiner has argued that Spaur teaches performance of multiple tasks, but has not presented any argument as to how Spaur can be considered to teach the use of two processors for the performance of such multiple tasks.

Applicant's independent claims 42 and 49 recite a gateway node comprising a real-time interface processor and an application processor and are also believed allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicant's dependent claim 24 recites distributing data processing functions of at least one component of the at least one vehicle internetwork among a plurality of processors.

In support of this rejection, the Examiner apparently has cited Chou at col. 10, lines 1-11, which describes the bundling of a remote diagnostics service with other services. However, the Examiner has not made clear how such bundling relates to distributing data processing functions of the vehicle internetwork among a plurality of processors.

In further support, the Examiner also has apparently cited Chou at col. 3, lines 46-67, which describes storage devices or the use of an alternative computing device. Again, the Examiner has not made clear how Chou here teaches a plurality of processors or distributing data processing.

Applicant's dependent claim 25 recites automatically organizing the plurality of network elements.

For this rejection, the Examiner has cited Chou (col. 7, lines 5-23), which describes the providing of a visual display output to the driver of the vehicle and that the driver may acknowledge this output. Yet, the Examiner has not presented any argument as to how this display relates to automatically organizing network elements.

Applicant's dependent claim 27 recites self-assembling the plurality of network elements.

The Examiner has cited Spaur (col. 12, lines 1-17) in support of this rejection. Spaur here describes a situation in which a vehicle device is not operating properly and the alteration of the presentation of this information. This does not teach or suggest the self-assembly of network elements.

Applicant has added new independent claims 56 and 57.

Applicant's new claim 56 recites that the gateway node in the vehicle comprises at least one real-time interface processor (RTIP) and at least one application processor, the RTIP performing real-time operations and the application processor performing high-level

processing functions. Applicant's believe claim 56 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Applicant's claim 1.

Applicant's new independent claim 57 recites automatically providing secure interoperability among the plurality of nodes of the at least one vehicle internetwork and the at least one peripheral electronic device in response to node information including configuration and security information.

When discussing Applicant's claim 1, the Examiner cited col. 1, lines 53-64, of Chou regarding providing secure interoperability. Applicant's claim 57 recites providing secure interoperability to a peripheral electronic device. In contrast, the Examiner's previously cited section of Chou describes the extraction of information from a vehicle's monitoring systems, its transfer to a remote service center for processing, and an information reply from the remote service center to the driver. There is no mention here in Chou of providing secure interoperability to a peripheral electronic device of a vehicle internetwork.

Chou also does not mention here that any secure interoperability is provided in response to configuration and security information. Instead, Chou merely describes the sending of information from the vehicle's monitoring system.

The Examiner has also cited Chou at col. 3, lines 16-32, as teaching using node information including configuration and security information to provide secure interoperability to at least one peripheral electronic device. Chou here describes that processor 300 of the vehicle is integrated with a network interface 320 to provide communication capability with the remote service center 200. Chou further describes that the network interface preferably comprises a wireless telephone and discusses related data communication aspects of the telephone. Yet, this cited section does not discuss providing secure interoperability to a peripheral electronic device.

Other sections of Chou discuss, for example, the detection of diagnostic trouble codes generated by the vehicle's electronic control units 103 (col. 6, lines 55-57). However, Chou does not teach or suggest automatically providing secure interoperability to at least one peripheral electronic device in response to node information including configuration and security information.

Further, Spaur does not teach or suggest this automatically providing secure interoperability. For example, Spaur at col. 10, lines 50-55, describes that in operatively connecting a controller area network (CAN) bus 126 to each vehicle device 50a-50n, each of these vehicle devices is operatively associated with a CAN interface, and that in one embodiment, each of the CAN interfaces is connected in "daisy-chain" fashion as part of the bus 126 configuration. However, the Examiner has not clearly argued how Spaur teaches here that secure interoperability is provided in response to configuration and security information. Therefore, claim 57 is believed allowable over Chou and Spaur.

Applicant's new dependent claims 58-60 are believed allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to dependent claims 24, 25, and 27.

Applicant's other dependent claims 2-16, 19-41, 43-48, and 50-55 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 42, and 49 and are believed allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the allowance of all pending claims. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Applicant believes that the Examiner's other arguments not specifically addressed above by Applicant are moot in light of the above arguments, but reserves the later right to address these arguments. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 09/680,608

PATENT
Docket No. 78700.020115

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2006

Bruce T. Neel
Reg. No. 37,406

Customer Number 33717
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Phone: (602) 445-8339
Fax: (602) 445-8100
E-mail: neelb@gtlaw.com